



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

9

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/461,938 12/15/99 LIAO

S 1279-293/099

EXAMINER

000167 HM12/0911
FULBRIGHT AND JAWORSKI L L P
PATENT DOCKETING 29TH FLOOR
865 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET
LOS ANGELES CA 90017-2576

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1642
DATE MAILED:

09/11/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory ActionApplication No.
09/461,938

Applicant(s)

Liao et al.

Examiner

Jennifer Hunt

Art Unit

1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED Aug 22, 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

4. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):

5. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).
6. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See attached

7. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
8. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
Claim(s) allowed: 3-8 and 11
Claim(s) objected to: _____
Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 2
9. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ a) ☐ has b) ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.
10. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
11. ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1642

Attachment to Advisory

1. The rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Liao et al., Cancer Epidemiology and Biomarkers, Volume 5, pages 549-557, 1996, IDS Document #27 is maintained for reasons of record.

Applicant argues that Liao et al. fails to teach the diagnosis of LSIL by observing MN/CA9 distribution in normal cells but not in atypical cells. Applicant's arguments filed 8-22-2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Liao et al. does correlates diagnosis of LSIL with the observation of MN/CA9 distribution in normal cells but not atypical cells. See page 551, second column, first full paragraph, which states that "With respect to the high levels of coexpressed MN antigen seen in dysplastic and normal-looking endocervical cells, the relative distribution of MN-positive cells in LSIL's and HSIL's were significantly different. In LSIL's, most of the MN positivity was seen in morphologically normal columnar/reserve or metaplastic cells but expressed only in a limited number of dysplastic cells. In contrast, most of the MN immunoreactive cells in HSIL's were dysplastic cells. The percentage of the cases with diffuse immunostaining in the NEC's was 9 versus 41 for HSIL's and LSIL's, respectively." See also that the abstract, and the full page 551, all of which clearly indicate that one of skill in the art would expect that a staining pattern in which MN/CA9 distribution was observed in normal cells but not atypical cells would be indicative of LSIL. Further, the methods used in the instant application are identical to those

Art Unit: 1642

taught in the prior art, and the conclusions drawn are likewise the same as set forth above, and in previous office actions.

Claims 3-8 and 11 are allowed. Claims 1-2 stand rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer Hunt, whose telephone number is (703) 308-7548. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday 6:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa can be reached at (703) 308-3995. The fax number for the group is (703) 305-3014 or (703) 308-4242.

Communications via internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [anthony.caputa@uspto.gov].

All internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists the possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set


Art Unit: 1642

forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Jennifer Hunt

September 2, 2001


ANTHONY C. CAPUTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600